

REMARKS

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of this application as amended.

Claims 1-3 and 28-30 have been amended. Claims 4-27 have been cancelled without prejudice. New claims 31-33 have been added. Therefore, claims 1-3, 28-30 and 31-33 are presented for examination.

35 U.S.C. § 103 Rejection

Claims 1-3, 19-22 and 28-30 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Rajasekharan, et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,480,961 (“Rajasekharan”) in view of Banker, et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,005,938 (“Banker”).

Applicants respectfully submit that Rajasekharan discloses “[a] method for secure streaming of digital audio/visual content.” Rajasekharan further discloses that “[s]ecure streaming provides protection against unauthorized use of the digital content.” (Abstract). Rajasekharan discloses that “[t]he content integrity values allow the playback device to determine whether the digital content is valid.” (col. 4, lines 22-23).

Banker discloses “[a] technique for preventing replay attacks on digital information distributed by network service providers.” (Abstract).

In contrast, claim 1, in pertinent part, recites “comparing the one or more fingerprint blocks generated at the server with the one or more fingerprint blocks generated at the client to verify validity of the requested data stream.” (emphasis provided). Rajasekharan fails to teach or reasonably suggest both the server and the client sampling and generating fingerprint blocks of the data stream, and subsequently comparing the client and server generated fingerprint blocks to verify the validity of the data stream, as recited by claim 1. In addition, Rajasekharan’s content integrity values

generated by the playback device are not the same as fingerprint blocks generated at the client to verify the validity of a data stream, as in claim 1. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the withdrawal of the rejection of claim 1 and its dependent claims.

Claim 28 contain limitations similar to those of claim 1. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the withdrawal of the rejection of claim 28 and its dependent claims.

New Claims

New independent claim 31 includes limitations similar to those of claim 1, and thus for the reasons stated above with respect to claim 1 are believed to be in condition for allowance. New claims 32-33 depend from claim 31, and are therefore also believed to be in condition for allowance.

Conclusion

In light of the foregoing, reconsideration and allowance of the claims is hereby earnestly requested.

Invitation for a Telephone Interview

The Examiner is requested to call the undersigned at (303) 740-1980 if there remains any issue with allowance of the case.

Request for an Extension of Time

Applicants respectfully petition for an extension of time to respond to the outstanding Office Action pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a) should one be necessary. Please charge our Deposit Account No. 02-2666 to cover the necessary fee under 37 C.F.R. § 1.17(a) for such an extension.

Charge our Deposit Account

Please charge any shortage to our Deposit Account No. 02-2666.

Respectfully submitted,

BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP

Date: October 10, 2006


Aslam A. Jaffery
Reg. No. 51,841

12400 Wilshire Boulevard
7th Floor
Los Angeles, California 90025-1030
(303) 740-1980